

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 2, 5, 10 and 14 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 and 12 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11-13 and 15 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,549,522 (Flynn). Further, claims 2 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Flynn in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,915,220 (Chelliah). Claims 3, 4, 8, 9 and 13 (sic) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Flynn in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,891,819 (Inoue et al.). Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (as best understood) as being unpatentable over Flynn, Chelliah and Inoue et al. Claims 5 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (as best understood) as being unpatentable over Flynn and internet draft reference entitled "Mobile IP Session Identifier Extension" (Mcann et al.). Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (as best understood) as being unpatentable over Flynn, Chelliah and Mcann et al. Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (as best understood) as being unpatentable over Flynn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Flynn. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Flynn discloses mobile data rate enhancement via foreign agent load balancing where data is routed through the Internet to a mobile node by using home agents and foreign agents to provide mobility functions. Data transfer rates to the mobile node are improved by providing for transfer of data from the home agent to a plurality of foreign agents on a round-robin basis, which can be enhanced by checking the quality of the connection between the foreign agent and the mobile node and re-routing the data through another foreign agent if certain predetermined quality criteria are not met.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Applicants submit that Flynn does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, a home agent setting the lifetime field of the registration release message to the value of 0 causing the first foreign agent to delete prior registration information of the mobile node, stored in at least a visitor table, after receipt for the registration release message. The Examiner admits that Flynn does not disclose or suggest these limitations on page 3, paragraph 4 of the Office Action, therefore, these rejections have been successfully traversed. However, since the Examiner asserts that Chelliah discloses these limitations in the claims of the present application, this reference will be discussed here.

Chelliah discloses a cellular telephone network within a telecommunications network for maintaining updated profile information for each mobile subscriber registered within the network. Updated profile information about each mobile subscriber is maintained within a

particular mobile switching center currently communicating with the particular mobile subscriber. This process is performed with minimal utilization of bandwidth between the various mobile switching centers and the telecommunications network by maintaining subscriber service profile information within mobile switching centers, even though the associated mobile subscriber has roamed from that mobile switching center. Updated subscriber service profile information is downloaded to a mobile switching center currently serving the mobile subscriber.

The Examiner asserts that Chelliah discloses deleting prior registration information at fig. 3 element 303, and col. 3, lines 17-23, the Examiner asserting that the MSC in Chelliah is analogous to the foreign agent in Applicant's claims. However, these portions of Chelliah merely disclose that an MSC receives a registration cancel message from a HLR and then deletes the service profile associated with the mobile subscriber from the visiting location register. This is not setting the lifetime field of the registration release message to the value of 0 causing the first HA to delete prior registration information of the mobile node, as recited in the claims of the present application. These portions of Chelliah merely relate to receiving a cancel message and deleting a service profile associated with a mobile subscriber. Chelliah does not disclose or suggest a registration release message with a lifetime field set to a value of 0. Further, Chelliah does not disclose or suggest the lifetime field of the registration release message being set to 0 causing the deletion of prior registration of a mobile node in a foreign agent.

Regarding claim 6 and 11, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 7 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1, 6, 7 and 11 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 2 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flynn in view of Chelliah, Inoue and further in view of McCann et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Inoue et al discloses a mobile IP communication scheme capable of authenticating an individual user who is operating the mobile computer when the mobile computer is connected to a visited site network and transmits a current location registration message to the home agent.

A user authentication to judge a properness of a user of the mobile computer is carried out according to the user input based information, and the current location of the mobile computer is registered at the mobile computer management device (home agent) when the user is judged as a proper user. The user authentication can be carried out either at the mobile computer management device or at the mobile computer.

McCann et al. discloses a mobile IP session identifier extension that can be used to distinguish registration requests belonging to various simultaneous sessions that a user may want to open using the same NAI from the same or different devices and to obtain a unique IP address for each session. How a dynamic address is to be managed when and if the user returns to the home network that assigned the address is also clarified.

Regarding claim 12, Applicants submit that none of the cited references take alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of this claim of, *inter alia*, transmitting a registration release message, having a data structure and type field value the same as the registration request message, from the home agent that has received the registration release message from the new foreign agent to an old foreign agent or where the home agent sets a lifetime field of the registration release message to a value of 0 to cause the deletion of the registration information of the mobile node in the old foreign agent that provided mobile IP service to the mobile node before the handoff. As noted previously, neither Flynn nor Chelliah disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. Further, neither Inoue nor McCann et al. overcome the substantial defects noted previously regarding Flynn and Chelliah. The Examiner asserts (in a different set of rejections) that Inoue discloses where the registration release message has a data structure and type field value identical to the registration request message, in Inoue's registration message structure and type field in fig. 2. However, fig. 2 of Inoue merely discloses a format of a registration message

transmitted from a mobile computer to a home agent and used to initiate registration processing (see, col. 7, lines 41-66). In contrast, the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to a registration and release message being sent from a home agent to a foreign agent. Further, Inoue discloses a format of a registration message to initiate a registration processing, whereas the limitations in the claims of the present application relate to a registration release message. Further, none of the cited references disclose or suggest a registration release message having a data structure and type field value the same as a registration request message.

Regarding claim 2, Applicants submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 2 and 12 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9 and 13 (sic) have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flynn in view of Inoue. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 7 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper

combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 3, 4, 8 and 9 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), (it appears although not clearly stated by the Examiner), as being unpatentable over Flynn, Chelliah and Inoue et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 12 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 13 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claims 5 and 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), (it appears although not clearly stated by the Examiner), as being unpatentable over Flynn and Mcann et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1 and 7 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, take alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 5 and 10 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 14 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), (it appears although not clearly stated by the Examiner), as being patentable over Flynn, Chelliah and Mcann et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 12 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 14 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), (it appears although not clearly stated by the Examiner), as being unpatentable over Flynn. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that this claim is dependent on independent claim 12 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Flynn does not disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 15 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Serial No. 10/026,520

Docket No. P-0315

Amdt. dated Proposed

Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11-13 and 15 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 56,408

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DCO/FDB:ch:tlg

Date: December 8, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610